

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated April 21, 2010, claims 1, 2, 7-9, 12, 14, 15, and 18-22 were presented for examination. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 1 and 7 were rejected under §112, second paragraph. Claims 7-9, 12, 14, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Abello et al.*, “Massive Quasi-Clique Detection,” 2002, in view of *Natarajan et al.*, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0151121. Claims 19-22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101

In the Office Action dated April 21, 2010, claim 1, 2, 5, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to overcome the above rejection directed to claims 1, 2, and 18. The amendments to claim 1 are aimed to connect the method steps to hardware elements, such as a processor and a memory. As was suggested by the Examiner, each of the claimed steps has been amended to connect with a hardware element, such a processor or memory. As amended, all steps of the claimed method are machine implemented. Support for this amendment is found in paragraph 0014 of Applicant’s publication. No new matter has been added with these amendments. Since the processor and memory are tangible hardware elements, the steps of claimed method tied to the hardware elements are considered statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove the rejection set forth under 35 U.S.C. §101 and grant an allowance of claims 1, 2, and 18.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

In the Office Action dated April 21, 2010, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. More specifically, with respect to claim 1, the Examiner raised a concern that claimed hardware elements, such as a memory and processor, are not incorporated

in any of claimed method steps. As noted above, Applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate hardware elements into the claimed method steps. With respect to claim 7, the Examiner indicated that the language of claim 7 does not comply with system claim language requirement. Applicant has amended claim 7 to overcome the rejection above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove the rejection set forth under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and grant an allowance of claim 1 and 7.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action dated April 21, 2010, claims 7-9, 12, 14, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Abello et al.*, “Massive Quasi-Clique Detection,” 2002, in view of *Natarajan et al.*, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0151121.

Applicant has amended independent claims 7 and 12 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claims 19 and 21, respectively. The prior rejections are now moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 7-9, 12, 14, and 15.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the forgoing amendment and remarks to the claims, it is submitted that all of the claims remaining in the application are now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Applicant is not conceding in this application that those claims in their prior forms are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claims are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that she be contacted at the number indicated below.

For the reasons outlined above, an allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
By: /Rochelle Lieberman/
Rochelle Lieberman
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 39,276

Lieberman & Brandsdorfer, LLC
802 Still Creek Lane
Gaithersburg, MD 20878-3218
Phone: (301) 948-7775
Fax: (301) 948-7774
email: rocky@legalplanner.com
Date: June 21, 2010